

### REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are pending in the application with Claims 1 and 6 being the independent claims.

The above Amendment introduces no new matter and its entry is respectfully requested. Further, Applicants point out that the above Amendment -- amending independent Claims 1 and 6 -- seeks to clarify the claims' language and does not narrow the scope of the claims from their original form.

Based on the above Amendments and the following Remarks, Applicants respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all outstanding rejections, and that they be withdrawn.

### Interview

The Applicants would like to thank Patent Examiner Willett and Supervisory Patent Examiner Rinehart for their time in conducting an informative interview with the Applicants' undersigned representative on July 25, 2002.

Claims 1-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,956,506 to Cobb, et al. ("Cobb") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,175 to Chow, et al. ("Chow"). This rejection is respectfully traversed below.

### Cobb in View of Chow Does Not Render the Claims Obvious

It is submitted that Cobb in view of Chow, fails to suggest or teach all the elements of independent Claims 1 and 6. All the limitations of the rejected claims must be taught or suggested by the references. M.P.E.P. § 2143.03. This, however, is not the case here as demonstrated below.

First, the Office Action admits, (see Office Action at paragraph 6), that the following element of the rejected independent claims are not taught by Cobb:

a request intercepting component, arranged to intercept requests from said client component to said server component, and to determine from said representation whether a request is supported by the server; wherein

said request intercepting component is arranged to search external sources to locate and provide to said server additional functionality when required for said server to support said request when said request is not currently supported.

Claim 1 (as amended); see also Claim 6, last element. Applicants agree.

Second, the Office Action erroneously concludes that “it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate the new version finder as taught in Chow into the enhanced objects described in the Cobb patent because Cobb operates with new objects and Chow suggests that the new objects can be found to increase functionality.” Office Action at paragraph 6. This is incorrect. Chow does not suggest “that the new objects can be found to increase functionality.” The Chow system appears to teach the automatic retrieval by a Web browser of pre-selected and identified Web pages from a Web server when those Web pages have changed. See Chow at c.5, l.64 - c.6, l.15. This is in contrast to the independent claims of the present invention which recite: “search external sources to locate and provide to said server additional functionality when required for said server to support said request when said request is not currently supported.” Claims 1 and 6.

In sum, given the admission in the Office Action and the failure of Chow to teach or suggest these missing elements in a manner properly combinable with Cobb with a reasonable expectation of success, the outstanding rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) is improper.

For at least the above-stated reasons, independent Claims 1 and 6 are allowable because they include features not taught or suggested by Cobb and Chow, either alone or in a proper combination. Further, dependent Claims 2-5 and 7-10 are allowable for at least the same reasons set forth herein with respect to independent Claims 1 and 6, and further in view of their own respective features.

### CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that a full and complete reply has been made to the outstanding Office Action and, as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider all presently outstanding rejections and that they be withdrawn. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned by telephone should the Examiner believe that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

PIPER RUDNICK LLP



---

Steven B. Kelber  
Registration No. 30,073  
Attorney of Record

Raymond Millien  
Registration No. 43,806

1200 Nineteenth Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20036-2412  
Telephone No. (202) 861-3900  
Facsimile No. (202) 223-2085

SERIAL NO. 09/220,436  
DOCKET NO.: 9545-008-27



MARKED-UP COPY OF AMENDED CLAIMS

1. (Amended) A computer system comprising:

a client component;

a server component, said client component arranged to make requests to said server component;

means for maintaining a representation of requests which can be satisfied by said server component; and

a request intercepting component, arranged to intercept requests from said client component to said server component, and to determine [establish] from said representation [if] whether a request is supported by [the] said server component; wherein

said request intercepting component is arranged to search external sources to locate and provide to said server component additional functionality [if] when required for said server component to support said request [if] when said request is not currently supported; and

said request intercepting component thereafter [passing the] invoking said request on [to] said server component [to execute] in a manner hidden from said client component.

6. (Amended) A computer system comprising:

a client component;

a server component, said client component arranged to make requests to said server component;

means for maintaining [including] a representation of requests which can be satisfied by said server component; and

means for intercepting requests from said client component to said server component, and for [establishing] determining from said representation [if] whether a request is supported by [the] said server component; said intercepting means being arranged to search external sources to locate and provide to said server component additional functionality required for said server component to support said request [if] when said request is not [already] currently supported; and for thereafter [passing the] invoking said request on [to] said server component [to execute] in a manner hidden from said client component.